

PROJECT: 23-1027 REST, TUUSI WANA RESTORATION PHASE 1

Sponsor: Umatilla Confederated Tribes Program: Salmon State Projects Status: Application Resubmitted

Parties to the Agreement

PRIMARY SPONSOR

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation

Address 46411 Timine Way**City** Pendleton**State** OR**Zip** 97801-9467**Org Type** Native American Tribe**Vendor #** SWV0015803-01**UBI****Date Org created****Org Notes**[link to Organization profile](#)☐ Org data updated

SECONDARY SPONSORS

No records to display

MANAGING AGENCY

Recreation and Conservation Office

LEAD ENTITY

Snake River Salmon Rec Bd LE

QUESTIONS

#1: List project partners and their role and contribution to the project.

WA DOE Streamflow Restoration program is contributing approximately \$2.8 MILLION to the project. Bonneville Power Administration will cover the salaries of Tribal employees who work on the project, and will pay for the conservation easement (\$2,800,000).

External Systems

SPONSOR ASSIGNED INFO

Sponsor-Assigned Project Number**Sponsor-Assigned Regions**

EXTERNAL SYSTEM REFERENCE

Source	Project Number	Submitter
HWS	23-1027	AFitzgerald

Project Application Report - 23-1027

Project Contacts

Contact Name Primary Org	Project Role	Work Phone	Work Email
<u>Kendall Barrameda</u> Rec. and Conserv. Office	Project Manager	(360) 764-9086	Kendall.Barrameda@rco.wa.gov
<u>Gerald Middel</u> Umatilla Confederated Tribes	Project Contact	(541) 969-9925	geraldmiddel@ctuir.org
<u>Ali Fitzgerald</u> Snake River Salmon Rec Bd LE	Lead Entity Contact	(509) 382-4115	ali@snakeriverboard.org

Worksites & Properties

Worksite Name

#1 Tuusi Wana Mainstem Touchet Walla Walla County, WA

Restoration	Property Name
✓	Touchet River Ranch

Project Application Report - 23-1027

Worksite Map & Description

Worksite #1: Tuusi Wana Mainstem Touchet Walla Walla County, WA

WORKSITE ADDRESS

Street Address Luckenbill Road
City, State, Zip Walla Walla WA 99362

Worksite Details

Worksite #1: Tuusi Wana Mainstem Touchet Walla Walla County, WA

SITE ACCESS DIRECTIONS

TARGETED ESU SPECIES

Species by ESU	Egg Present	Juvenile Present	Adult Present	Population Trend
Chinook-unidentified		✓	✓	Unknown
Steelhead-Middle Columbia River, Touchet River, Threatened		✓	✓	Declining

Reference or source used

TARGETED NON-ESU SPECIES

Species by Non-ESU	Notes
Lamprey	Known to migrate through the reach

Questions

#1: Give street address or road name and mile post for this worksite if available.

6535/6539 Luckenbill Road Walla Walla WA

Project Application Report - 23-1027

Project Location

RELATED PROJECTS

Projects in PRISM

PRISM Number	Project Name	Program Name	Current Status	Relationship Type	Notes
22-1016 P	Túuši Wána Design Project Touchet River RM 14	Salmon Federal Projects	Active	Earlier Phase	
23-1144 R	Tuusi Wana Restoration (Large Cap)	Salmon State Projects	Application Returned	Current Phase	

Related Project Notes

Questions

#1: Project location. Describe the geographic location, water bodies, and the location of the project in the watershed, i.e. nearshore, tributary, main-stem, off-channel, etc.

This project is located on the mainstem Touchet River between the towns of Prescott and Touchet in Walla Walla County. The Touchet River is a tributary to the Walla Walla River. The project reach is located in WRIA 32. The coordinates of the upper most part of the project are 46 Degrees 13' 27" N and 118 Degrees 35' 21" W while the coordinates of the downstream limits of the project are 46 Degrees 11' 53" N and 118 Degrees 38' 15" W. This project lies at approximately Touchet River Mile 14.5 to 17.5. The adjacent valley and floodplain area on this 3 mile stretch exceed 250 acres. This region is primary used as commercial agriculture.

#2: How does this project fit within your regional recovery plan and/or local lead entity's strategy to restore or protect salmonid habitat? Cite section and page number.

The proposed project is identified as a priority project in the Snake River Salmon Recovery Plan for SE Washington (2011) and 3-year work plan for which the Board is tasked with implementing as part of the Snake River Salmon Recovery Plan for SE Washington (2011). This stretch of the mainstem Touchet is considered a Priority Migratory Reach by the SRSRB.

This project is also in direct alignment with the Walla Walla Water 2050 plan, led by Ecology, and supports the implementation of the Tier 1.01 top priority strategy identified in the plan to reconnect floodplain and restore channel complexity to reduce flood risk and improve habitat. Additionally, this project also supports the implementation of the Total Maximum Daily Load Water Quality Implementation Plans associated with the Touchet and Walla Walla watersheds.

#3: Is this project part of a larger overall project?

Yes

#3a: How does this project fit into the sequencing of the larger project?

In Phase 1, we will be doing the work to create a 400 acre conservation easement. In Phase 2 (2025) we will be adding water rights into the project.

#4: Is the project on State Owned Aquatic Lands? Please contact the Washington State Department of Natural Resources to make a determination. [Aquatic Districts and Managers](#)

No

Project Application Report - 23-1027

Property Details

Property: Touchet River Ranch (Worksite #1: Tuusi Wana Mainstem Touchet Walla Walla County, WA)

✓ Restoration

LANDOWNER

Name John and Susan Gailey
Address Luckenbill Road
City Walla Walla
State WA Zip 99362
Type Private

CONTROL & TENURE

Instrument Type Easement - Permanent
Timing Proposed
Term Length Perpetuity
Yrs
Expiration Date
Note

Project Proposal

Project Description

The Tuusi Wana Design Project area is located along the Touchet River in Walla Walla County Washington at approximately River Mile (RM) 14 to 17. The project is entirely on privately owned land. Habitat conditions for juvenile and adult salmonids have been impaired within the project area by riparian clearing, regional agriculture, and sediment deposition. This project is intended to improve conditions, so they more closely resemble target conditions outlined in the Umatilla Tribes' River Vision. In line with this River Vision, the project elements include improving degraded hydrology, reclaiming geomorphic function, providing habitat connectivity, supporting a diverse riverine biotic community, and restoring riparian vegetation diversity and density. The general goals include improving holding, overwintering, and migration refugia throughout the reach to support upstream migrating adult salmonids, improving high-flow refugia and rearing habitat for juvenile salmonids utilizing lower reaches of Touchet River for rearing or during outmigration, recovery of more natural river valley geomorphic processes through the installation of a large number of large wood structures (LWS) intended to initiate and maintain in the mid-term increased hydraulic variability leading to a more complex channel planform (e.g., split flows) and depth variations (e.g., pools and bars), and the recovery of more natural riparian processes through the installation of a large quantity of live cuttings.

Project Questions

Project Application Report - 23-1027

#1: Problem statement. What are the problems your project seeks to address? Include the source and scale of each problem. Describe the site, reach, and watershed conditions. Describe how those conditions impact salmon populations. Include current and historic factors important to understand the problems.

The project area has been negatively impacted by intensive riparian clearing, channelization, bank armoring, floodplain clearing, hillslope clearing, and levee construction. Riparian clearing occurred until at least 1996 and has resulted in a sparse and immature riparian community. Today, the riparian community can be classified as entirely absent or early to mid-seral stage. These smaller wood dimensions have resulted in moderated channel erosion rates. Channelization, floodplain grading, and bank armoring appear to have been evident by 1952 and continued to accelerate in scope and scale through the 1970s. These actions are evident by meander scars and channels visible in the 1952 aerial disappearing by the 1964 arials. These actions were likely both a desire to maximize land productive for agriculture and as a reaction to flooding in the 1960s and early 1970s and have straightened the channel and reduced its ability to migrate within the floodplain as compared with historical conditions. The concentrated streamflow has combined with significant aggradation of the floodplain, driven primarily by hillslope erosion related to land clearing, leading to widespread channel disconnection from the floodplain (USDA 1979, USGS 1998, USGS 1969). This has significantly reduced floodplain connectivity, contributed a high load of fine sediments, and reduced channel complexity. Riparian clearing began early in Euro American settlement and has occurred throughout the project area, continuing until at least 1996. This has resulted in an immature riparian community which provides limited shade, limited structure to drive and moderate channel migration, and limited instream wood sources compared to historical conditions. Floodplain aggradation also disconnected large portions of the valley floor from intermediate flood events (e.g., 2-year, 5-year). This, combined with agricultural clearing and grading, has resulted in a valley floor largely devoid of floodplain vegetation assemblages that would be typical of the region's intermediate floodplain surfaces (e.g., cottonwood). As the floodplain aggraded relative to the channel, smaller inset point bars and floodplains have developed, and today, riparian plant assemblages have occupied these surfaces. Many of these surfaces have been occupied by False Indigo (*Amorpha fruticosa*), which was planted by the Civilian Conservation.

Native plants species are virtually absent along this reach. There is little to no shade. Winter flows are too high and with little to no refuge from higher flows, overwintering juvenile salmonids get flushed out of the reach.

Project Application Report - 23-1027

#2: Describe the limiting factors, and/or ecological concerns, and limiting life stages (by fish species) that your project expects to address.

Within the mainstem Touchet River the primary limiting factors for steelhead and other salmonids include sedimentation, habitat diversity, flow, channel stability and temperature (SRSRB Recovery Plan for SE Washington, 2011). Secondary limiting factors include predation and a lack of key habitat.

Factors limiting production of summer steelhead and spring chinook salmon in this reach are largely similar. Primary limiting factors for summer rearing juvenile summer steelhead and spring chinook salmon include water quality (temperature and sedimentation) and limited in-stream flow. This project seeks to address water quality by both increasing riparian vegetation conditions and providing increased access to the floodplain to drive hyporheic exchange and buffer water temperatures. In-stream flows may be influenced by increases in hyporheic exchange as well, but more significant improvements in in-stream flows are anticipated in the future through ongoing water rights acquisitions (see Walla Walla 2050).

Additional limiting factors for juvenile steelhead and chinook rearing present in the reach that this project will address include large wood density, riparian function, and key habitat (pools). This project will evaluate how to increase complexity in the reach through large wood addition to strategically split flows, create sustainable pool and off-channel habitat, and increase the floodplain and riparian area in active connection with the river channel.

Winter rearing of juvenile steelhead and spring chinook salmon are limited by similar physical habitat factors, but temperature and flow are less impactful in winter. Similarly, Bull Trout utilize the area for Feeding, Migration, and Overwintering (FMO). Large wood density and channel complexity will be addressed by designing for conditions that allow channel processes to function and create sustainable winter-rearing habitat. Predation by non-native species is not a widely acknowledged limiting factor in this location.

#3: What are the project goals? The goal of the project should be to solve identified problems by addressing the root causes. Then clearly state the desired future condition. Include which species and life stages will benefit from the outcome, and the time of year the benefits will be realized. **Example Goals and Objectives**

This project goal is to improve conditions of the project area, so they more closely resemble target conditions outlined in the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation's (CTUIR) "River Vision" (Jones et al. 2008). In line with this River Vision, the project elements described here are intended to restore and reclaim the processes needed to support aquatic First Foods. These processes include improving degraded hydrology, reclaiming geomorphic function, providing habitat connectivity, supporting a diverse riverine biotic community, and restoring riparian vegetation diversity and density (Jones et al. 2008). We will also improve holding, overwintering, and migration refugia habitat throughout reach to support upstream migrating adult salmonids and improve high flow refugia and rearing habitat for juvenile salmonids utilizing lower reaches of Touchet River for rearing or during outmigration.

Mid-Columbia steelhead juveniles and adults will benefit from this project. Juveniles (fry) rear in this reach of the river year round while adults migration of steelhead occurs from December to June. Adult Bull trout migrate through this reach in May and June, Chinook juveniles rear in this reach year round while adults Migrate through the reach in May and June. Source: Stillwater Ecological Flow Report (2013).

Project Application Report - 23-1027

#4: What are the project objectives? Objectives support and refine biological goals, breaking them down into smaller steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound). [Example Goals and Objectives](#)

Primary limiting factors in terms of habitat include in-channel characteristics, passage and entrainment, and riparian and floodplain. The objectives address the limiting factors. Installing wood structures including bank margin, apex jams, floodplain jams, off-channel post assisted structures and removing rip rap and berms along the channel will meet the objectives of increasing channel complexity, increasing stream velocity diversity at a range of flows and increasing the quantity and quality of habitat diversity. The instream wood structures will also improve sediment sorting and routing. Wood structures placed both instream and, on the floodplain, will increase the availability of juvenile rearing habitat. Large wood structures and removal of rip rap and berm will increase the floodplain connectivity and the overall riparian function. Revegetation with native species will help to meet the objective of increasing instream thermal diversity. Along the entire 3-mile stretch, we intend to install 90 bank buried wood structures, 30 apex log jams, 46 floodplain large wood structures and 48 post assisted log structures. About 2000 cubic yards of rip rap and berm material will be removed. There will also be an aggressive riparian planting plan that includes planting up to 70,000 live bank stakes of willow and cottonwood. An additional 300 acres will be planted out as well according to the design plans.

#5: Scope of work and deliverables. Provide a detailed description of each project task/element. With each task/element, identify who will be responsible for each, what the deliverables will be, and the schedule for completion.

The Scope of Work includes the completion of the designs, the cultural resources surveys and reporting, the permit process including JARPA and BPA HIP procedures, soliciting contractors through the competitive bid process to implement the construction, choosing a contractor to implement, surveying and laying out the project site, actually building the project, supervising the project, and conducting the as-built designs. We anticipate the project construction will be broken up into three separate years thereby completing the project in 2026.

The 100% designs will be completed by Inter-Fluve in July of 2023. Also in August of 2023, the CTUIR Cultural Resources Protection Program (CRPP) is expected to finish their survey of the APE. Then the CTUIR CRPP is scheduled to have their report written by September 31, 2023. Then project manager Jerry Middel will submit the JARPA and BPA HIP requirements by October 15, 2023. Typically entities involved in JARPA and HIP respond within 45 days. We intend to get the entire APE over the 3 miles cleared in the fall of 2023.

During this waiting period for the permitting requirements to finalize, project manager Jerry Middel will work with CTUIR Administration to solicit and hire a contractor through the competitive bid process to build the project. We expect to begin solicitations in November 2023 with the goal of hiring a contractor by February 15, 2024 to begin the construction project. Ideally, we would break the construction work into 3 phases over 3 years to complete the entire 3 mile restoration work. That translates into about 1 mile per year undergoing construction.

All fish salvage operations will be conducted by CTUIR Fisheries Staff prior to construction.

Construction will be supervised by Jerry Middel and the Inter-Fluve design team. Both Middel and Inter-Fluve representatives will be responsible for daily monitoring logs during construction and conducting the As-built survey.

In terms of the acquisition, we are currently coordinating with Blue Mountain Land Trust to conduct the land survey and appraisal for a permanent CE. In terms of the water rights acquisition, Anton Chiono of the CTUIR Water Resources Department will work with the WA State Department of Ecology to conduct all research and gain ECY's approval.

Project Application Report - 23-1027

#6: What are the assumptions and physical constraints that could impact whether you achieve your objectives?

Assumptions and constraints are external conditions that are not under the direct control of the project, but directly impact the outcome of the project. These may include ecological and geomorphic factors, land use constraints, public acceptance of the project, delays, or other factors. How will you address these issues if they arise?

We are in a good place in terms of having limited constraints on the project. This is primarily due to the fact that the entire project is within the ownership of one landowner. We have been working developing the objectives with the landowner since 2019. The Tribes and the landowner have signed several documents that have helped to move this project forward. We have a notarized Riparian Conservation Agreement with the landowner (see attached). We are in negotiations now to create the entire floodplain as part of the permanent CE. This would be much larger in area than the originally proposed 200-acre CE.

#7: How have lessons learned from completed projects or monitoring studies informed this project?

We just completed a 3 yearlong 3-mile-long project on the North Touchet that was funded in part by the SRFB. The lessons learned from those projects are varied and they do not all apply to this project. Perhaps one important lesson learned is to look into the flexibility of the engineer. At times, we found our last engineer a bit intransigent when it came to making changes to their design. Next time, we will include during the interview hiring process that the chosen firm answers questions positively about making design changes to accommodate the technical team's request.

#8: Describe the alternatives considered and why the preferred was chosen.

The alternatives analysis currently underway through the design process.

This site was chosen due to its large footprint potential. A 3 mile long river restoration project that combines a 200 acre permanent conservation easement (and potentially 500 acres) and the acquisition of instream water rights (we are in negotiation with the landowner to give up farming entirely and put all current water rights instream) provides the incentive to pursue the project and the funding to complete it.

An additional reason to pursue the project is its location in relation to another property that is considered outstanding habitat by Washing Department of Fish and Wildlife. Upstream, for about 4 miles is some of the best habitat remaining on the mainstem Touchet. WDFW Walla Walla District Offices have been trying to purchase the "Drumheller" property upstream of the proposed project for a couple of years. The Tuusi Wana project would add a piece of longitudinal connectivity that would complement the "Drumheller" piece.

#9: How were stakeholders consulted in the development of this project? Identify the stakeholders, their concerns or feedback, and how those concerns were addressed.

SRSRB was contacted about this project early on. SRSRB staff took a tour of the site and determined the project had merit and should be pursued. WDFW was contacted about this project. WDFW staff determined the project had merit and should be pursued. CTUIR has given the go-ahead to pursue the project. We have engaged with the landowners over a couple of years now, and they are eager to get this project on the ground.

Going forward, we will continue to engage all stakeholders and partners on a regular basis. For example, at each stage of the design process, we will engage with the landowners and present our preferred alternative and obtain landowner buyoff in addition to tech panel buyoff before proceeding to next design stage.

#10: Does your project address or accommodate the anticipated effects of climate change?

Yes

Project Application Report - 23-1027

#10a: How will your project be climate resilient given future conditions?

Beechie et al. (2013) found that restoring floodplain connectivity, restoring streamflow regimes, and re-aggrading incised channels are most likely to ameliorate streamflow and temperature changes associated with climate change, thereby increasing salmonid habitat diversity and population resilience. Actions we propose in this project seek to restore floodplain connectivity and aggrade incised channels, thereby restoring streamflow regimes closer to unadulterated conditions, and improving ecosystem resilience to climate change. Reconnecting and/or creating side-channels, removing and/or setting back levees, and re-meandering straightened channels can buffer peak flow increases by storing flood water and reducing flood peaks (Sparks et al. 1998; McAlister et al. 2000). These actions can also increase the variability of velocity and increase thermal refugia (Sommer et al. 2001; Morley et al., 2005; Jefferes et al., 2008; Poole et al., 2008).

#10b: How will your project increase habitat and species adaptability?

This project will restore fish habitat and reconnect the floodplain. Floodplains increase the residence time of water, wood, & nutrients in a system. Rather than being flushed out at periods of high flows, rivers with connected floodplains retain water for a longer time, and store wood and nutrients. Connected floodplains have greater habitat complexity due to deposition, accumulation of inputs, and increased residence times. Connected floodplains can have a greater density of periphyton and benthic invertebrates. Salmon habitat use can be greater in connected floodplains. Out migrating salmon can have a better condition factor in rivers with connected floodplains. Rivers with connected floodplains can have a larger abundance of salmonids. Connected floodplains result in reduced flood-risk during peak flows, result in attenuating changes to stream temperature, result in enhancing low flows and connected floodplains are a logical restoration tool due to changing climatic conditions.

#11: Describe the sponsor's experience managing this type of project. Describe other projects where the sponsor has successfully used a similar approach.

Staff for this project includes at least 5 CTUIR full time employees; Jerry Middel, Ethan Green, Morgan Clay, Anton Chiono, Julie Burke and James Hudson. Jerry Middel will be the lead project manager for this project. He will be supported by the remainder of the staff on an as needed basis. This staffing arrangement has been approved the CTUIR Fisheries Habitat Manager Mike Lambert (contact MikeLambert@ctuir.org) . Jerry Middel leads habitat restoration efforts in the Touchet portion of the Walla Walla sub basin for the CTUIR. Jerry has over 30 years' experience working in natural resources in both the private and public sectors from SE Alaska to the North Cascades and the Blue Mountains of southeastern Washington. Jerry holds a master's of science degree in Environmental Studies and a Bachelor's degree in Biology. We would like to point out that the staff included here just completed a 3 mile, 3 yearlong \$4 million dollar project on the North Touchet River.

#12: Will veterans (including the veterans conservation corps) be involved in the project? If yes, please describe.

No

Project Application Report - 23-1027

Restoration Supplemental

#1: What level of design (per Appendix D) have you completed? Please attach.

Preliminary

#1a: What level of design will be produced prior to construction?

Final

#2: Will (or did) a licensed professional engineer design the project?

Yes

#3: Does the project include measures to stabilize an eroding stream bank?

No

#4: Is the primary activity of the project invasive species removal?

No

#5: Is the primary activity of the project riparian planting?

No

#6: Describe the steps you will take to minimize the introduction of invasive species during construction and restoration. Consider how you will use un-infested materials and clean equipment entering and leaving the project area.

All heavy equipment will be washed and inspected prior to entering the site.

#7: Describe the long-term stewardship and maintenance obligations for the project.

To be determined

Restoration Metrics

Worksite: Tuusi Wana Mainstem Touchet Walla Walla County, WA (#1)

Miles of Stream and/or Shoreline Treated or Protected (C.0.b)	3.
Project Identified In a Plan or Watershed Assessment (C.0.c)	National Marine Fisheries Service, 200 Middle Columbia River Steelhead Distir Population Segment ESA Recovery Pla Portland, O
Priority in Recovery Plan	This reach is a priority for restoration in t SE WA Recovery PI
Type Of Monitoring (C.0.d.1)	No
Monitoring Location (C.0.d.2)	No monitoring complet

INSTREAM HABITAT PROJECT

Total Miles Of Instream Habitat Treated (C.4.b)	3.
---	----

Channel structure placement (C.4.d.1)

Total cost for Channel structure placement	\$650,0
Material Used For Channel Structure (C.4.d.2)	Individual Logs (Anchore Individual Lo (Unanchore Logs Fastened Togeth (Logja Stumps With Roots Attach (Rootwar

Miles of Stream Treated for channel structure placement (C.4.d.3)	3.
---	----

Project Application Report - 23-1027

Pools Created through channel structure placement (C.4.d.5)

Number of structures placed in channel (C.4.d.7)

2

Project Application Report - 23-1027

Overall Project Metrics

COMPLETION DATE

Projected date of completion

12/31/20

Restoration Cost Estimates

Worksite #1: Tuusi Wana Mainstem Touchet Walla Walla County, WA

Category	Work Type	Estimated Cost	Note
Instream Habitat Project	Channel structure placement (C.4.d.1)	\$650,000	
	Subtotal:	\$650,000	
	Total Estimate For Worksite:	\$650,000	

Summary

Total Estimated Costs:	\$650,000
Total Estimated Restoration Costs:	\$650,000

Cost Summary

	Estimated Cost	Project %	Admin/AA&E %
Restoration Costs			
Restoration	\$650,000		
SUBTOTAL	\$650,000	100.00 %	
Total Cost Estimate	\$650,000	100.00 %	

Funding Request and Match

FUNDING PROGRAM

Salmon State Projects	\$550,000	84.615385 %
-----------------------	-----------	-------------

SPONSOR MATCH

Other Monetary Funding	Grant - State		
Amount			\$100,000.
		Note: Funded	
Funding Organization			Department of Ecolo
Grant Program			Streamflow Restorati
	Match Total:	\$100,000	15.384615 %
	Total Funding Request (Funding + Match):	\$650,000	100.000000 %

Questions

#1: Explain how you determined the cost estimates

I used the engineer's estimation of probable cost.

Cultural Resources

Cultural Resource Areas

Project Application Report - 23-1027

Worksite #1: Tuusi Wana Mainstem Touchet Walla Walla County, WA

Area: Approximate APE

- #1: Provide a description of the project actions at this worksite (acquisition, development and/or restoration activities that will occur as a part of this project)

Restoration activities include excavating to remove portions of berm, digging to set large wood, digging for planting and excavating to remove debris.

- #2: Describe all ground disturbing activities (length, width and depth of disturbance and equipment utilized) that will take place in the Area of Potential Effect (APE). Include the location of any construction staging or access roads associated with your project that will involve ground disturbance.

See map package for details

- #3: Describe any planned ground disturbing pre-construction/restoration work. This includes geo-technical investigation, fencing, demolition, decommissioning roads, etc.

Grubbing

- #4: Describe the existing project area conditions. The description should include existing conditions, current and historic land uses and previous excavation/fill (if depths and extent is known, please describe).

This is nearly 100% agricultural land used for growing various types of hay.

- #5: Will a federal permit be required to complete the scope of work on the project areas located within this worksite?
Yes

- #5a: List the agency that will be issuing the permit and the date you anticipate applying for and receiving the permit. Will the federal permit cover ALL proposed ground disturbing activities included in the project?

Bonneville Power Administration

- #6: Are you utilizing Federal Funding to complete the scope of work? This includes funds that are being shown as match or not.
Yes

- #6a: Please list the federal agency and funding sources.

BPA, NOAA

- #6b: Does the federal funding you are utilizing as match require you to receive state funding?

Yes

- #7: Do you have knowledge of any previous cultural resource review within the project boundaries during the past 10 years?
No

- #8: Is the worksite located within an existing park, wildlife refuge, natural area preserve, or other recreation or habitat site?
No

- #9: Are there any structures over 45 years of age within this worksite? This includes structures such as buildings, tidegates, dikes, residential structures, bridges, rail grades, park infrastructure, etc.
No

Project Application Report - 23-1027

Project Permits

Permits and Reviews	Issuing Organization	Applied Date	Received Date	Expiration Date	Permit #
Cultural Assessment [Section 106]	DAHP	08/15/2023			
Dredge/Fill Permit [Section 10/404 or 404]	Army Corps of Eng.	10/31/2023			
Hydraulics Project Approval [HPA]	Dept of Fish & Wildlife	10/31/2023			

Note: Cultural Resources scheduled to begin in summer of 2023

Permit Questions

- #1: Are you planning on using the federal permit streamlining process? **Limit 8**
No

Project Application Report - 23-1027

Attachments

Required Attachments

6 out of 6 done

Applicant Resolution/Authorizations	✓
Cost Estimate	✓
Landowner acknowledgement form	✓
Map: Restoration Worksite	✓
Photo	✓
RCO Fiscal Data Collection Sheet	✓

PHOTOS (JPG, GIF)

Photos (JPG, GIF)



550478



554325

PROJECT DOCUMENTS AND PHOTOS

Project Documents and Photos

File Type	Attach Date	Attachment Type	Title	Person	File Name, Number Associations	Sh:
	06/21/2023	Design document	2023_06_21_TechMemo.pdf	GeraldM	2023_06_21_TechMemo.pdf, 567245	✓
	06/15/2023	RCO Fiscal Data Collection Sheet	FiscalDataCollectionSheet_Grant_23-1027.pdf	GeraldM	FiscalDataCollectionSheet_Grant_23-1027.pdf, 565970	
	05/24/2023	Application Review Report	Grant Manager Comments, 23-1027R(rtnd 05/24/23 16:04)	KendallB	Grant Manager Comments Report - 23-1027 (rtnd 05-24-2023_16-04-05).pdf, 563835	✓
	04/14/2023	Cost Estimate	SAL-CostEstimate_Túuši Wána RESTORATION04042023.xlsx	GeraldM	SAL-CostEstimate_Túuši Wána RESTORATION04042023.xlsx, 558155	✓
	04/14/2023	Project Application Report	Project Application Report, 23-1027R (sub 04/14/23 08:40:13)	AliF	Project Application Report - 23-1027 (submitted 04-14-2023_08-40-13).pdf, 558146	✓
	04/14/2023	Applicant Resolution/Authorizations	ApplicantAuthorizationResolution.pdf	AliF	ApplicantAuthorizationResolution.pdf, 558142	✓
	03/13/2023	Landowner acknowledgement form	LA_TUUSIWANA2023.jpg	GeraldM	LA_TUUSIWANA2023.jpg, 554325	
	02/02/2023	Photo	TUUSIWANA_1.jpg	GeraldM	TUUSIWANA_1.jpg, 550478	✓
	01/24/2023	Map: Area of Potential Effect (APE)	APE_LAYER.zip	GeraldM	APE_LAYER.zip, 549472	✓
	01/24/2023	Map: Restoration Worksite	Parcel Map.pdf	GeraldM	Parcel Map.pdf, 549470	✓
	01/24/2023	Design document	TuusiWana_ModelOutput_Proposed.pdf	GeraldM	TuusiWana_ModelOutput_Proposed.pdf, 549463	✓
	01/24/2023	Design document	TuusiWana_ModelOutput_Comparison_Vel	GeraldM	TuusiWana_ModelOutput_Comparison... 549462	✓
	01/24/2023	Design document	TuusiWana_ModelOutput_Comparison_De	GeraldM	TuusiWana_ModelOutput_Comparison... 549461	✓
	01/24/2023	Design document	7.5_Hydraulic_Figures.pdf	GeraldM	7.5_Hydraulic_Figures.pdf, 549460	✓
	01/24/2023	Cost Estimate	7.3_OPCC.pdf	GeraldM	7.3_OPCC.pdf, 549459	✓
	01/24/2023	Preliminary design report	1.0_TuusiWana_GPDSR_Prelim_20221130	GeraldM	1.0_TuusiWana_GPDSR_Prelim_2022... 549458	✓
	01/24/2023	Preliminary design report	7.1_Project_Plan_Sheets.pdf	GeraldM	7.1_Project_Plan_Sheets.pdf, 549457	✓
	01/12/2023	Project Review Comments	Project Review Comments Report, 23-1027R (01/12/23 08:31:47)	BrentH	Project Review Comments Report - 23-1027 (01-12-2023_08-31-47).pdf, 547770	✓
	01/12/2023	Project Application Report	Project Application Report, 23-1027R (01/12/23 08:31:47)	BrentH	Project Application Report - 23-1027 (01-12-2023_08-31-47).pdf, 547769	✓
	01/12/2023	Project Review Comments	Project Review Comments Report, 23-1027C (01/12/23 08:31:08)	BrentH	Project Review Comments Report - 23-1027 (01-12-2023_08-31-08).pdf, 547768	✓
	01/12/2023	Project Application Report	Project Application Report, 23-1027C (01/12/23 08:31:08)	BrentH	Project Application Report - 23-1027 (01-12-2023_08-31-08).pdf, 547767	✓

Project Application Report - 23-1027

Application Status

Application Due Date: 06/27/2023

Status Name	Status Date	Submitted By	Submission Notes
Application Resubmitted	06/22/2023	Gerald Middel	
Application Returned	05/24/2023	Kendall Barrameda	
Application Submitted	04/14/2023	Ali Fitzgerald	
Preapplication	01/09/2023		

I certify that to the best of my knowledge, the information in this application is true and correct. Further, all application requirements due on the application due date have been fully completed to the best of my ability. I understand that if this application is found to be incomplete, it will be rejected by RCO. I understand that I may be required to submit additional documents before evaluation or approval of this project and I agree to provide them. (Gerald Middel, 06/22/2023)

Date of last change: 06/22/2023